

Thermal Vacuum Radiation in Spontaneously Broken Second-Quantized Theories on Curved Phase Spaces of Constant Curvature

M. CALIXTO^{1,2} AND V. ALDAYA²

¹ *Departamento de Matemática Aplicada y Estadística, Universidad Politécnica de Cartagena, Paseo Alfonso XIII 56, 30203 Cartagena, Spain*

² *Instituto de Astrofísica de Andalucía (IAA-CSIC), Apartado Postal 3004, 18080 Granada, Spain*

Manuel.Calixto@upct.es

valdaya@iaa.es

Abstract

We construct second-quantized (field) theories on coset spaces of pseudo-unitary groups $U(N_+, N_-)$. The existence of degenerated quantum vacua (coherent states of zero modes) leads to a breakdown of the original pseudo-unitary symmetry. The action of some spontaneously broken symmetry transformations destabilize the vacuum and make it to *radiate*. We study the structure of this *thermal* radiation for curved phase spaces of constant curvature: complex projective spaces $\mathbb{CP}^{N-1} = SU(N)/U(N-1)$ and open complex balls $\mathbb{CD}^{N-1} = SU(1, N-1)/U(N-1)$. Positive curvature is related to generalized Fermi-Dirac (FD) statistics, whereas negative curvature is connected with generalized Bose-Einstein (BE) statistics, the standard cases being recovered for $N = 2$. We also make some comments on the contribution of the vacuum (dark) energy to the cosmological constant and the phenomenon of inflation.

PACS: 03.65.Fd, 04.62.+v, 04.70.Dy, 67.40.Db, 11.30.Qc, 98.80.Qc

Keywords: group representation theory, coherent states, pseudo-unitary groups, coset spaces, curvature, Bergmann's kernel, zero modes, ground state excitations, Fulling-Unruh effect, vacuum energy, spontaneous symmetry breaking, quantum statistics.

1 Introduction

Quantum vacua are not really empty to every observer. Actually, the quantum vacuum is filled with zero-point fluctuations of quantum fields. The situation is similar to quantum many-body condensed matter systems describing, for example, superfluidity and superconductivity, where the ground state mimics the quantum vacuum in many respects and quasiparticles (particle-like excitations above the ground state) play the role of matter.

We know that zero-point energy, like other non-zero vacuum expectation values, leads to observable consequences as, for instance, the Casimir effect, and influences the behaviour of the Universe at cosmological scales, where the vacuum (dark) energy is expected to contribute to the cosmological constant, which affects the expansion of the universe, i.e. the phenomenon of

inflation (see e.g. [1] for a nice review). Indeed, dark energy is the most popular way to explain recent observations that the universe appears to be expanding at an accelerating rate.

Also, in Quantum Field Theory, the vacuum state is expected to be stable under some underlying group of symmetry transformations G (namely, the Poincaré group). Then the action of some spontaneously broken symmetry transformations can destabilize/excite the vacuum and make it to *radiate*. Such is the case of the Planckian radiation of the Poincaré invariant vacuum under uniform accelerations, that is, the Fulling-Unruh effect [2, 3], which shares some features with the (black-hole evaporation) Hawking effect [4]. Here, the Poincaré invariant vacuum looks the same to every inertial observer but converts itself into a thermal bath of radiation with temperature $T = \hbar a / 2\pi c k_B$ in passing to a uniformly accelerated frame (a denotes the acceleration, c the speed of light and k_B the Boltzmann constant). These radiation phenomena are usually linked to some kind of global mutilation of the spacetime (viz, existence of horizons). In the reference [5], it was shown that the reason for this radiation is more profound and related to the spontaneous breakdown of the conformal symmetry in *quantum* field theory. From this point of view, a Poincaré invariant vacuum can be regarded as a coherent state of conformal zero modes, which are undetectable (‘dark’) by inertial observers but unstable under relativistic uniform accelerations (special conformal transformations). There we used the conformal group in (1+1)-dimensions, $SO(2,2) \simeq SO(2,1) \times SO(2,1)$, which consists of two copies of the pseudo-orthogonal group $SO(2,1)$ (left- and right-moving modes, respectively).

In [6] we constructed $O(3), O(2,1)$ and Newton-Hooke invariant quantum field theories in a unified manner. We could think of $O(3)$ and $O(2,1)$ as isometry subgroups of the spatial part of de Sitter and Anti de Sitter spaces, with positive and negative curvature κ , respectively. In [7] we studied the thermodynamics of the excited ground state of a quantum many-body system with broken unitary $U(N)$ symmetry and their relation to Fermi-Dirac statistics, restricting ourselves to the fundamental representation.

In this paper we extend this construction to general (pseudo)-unitary symmetry groups. We study the spontaneous breakdown of the pseudo-unitary symmetry in second-quantized field theories on coset spaces of $U(N_+, N_-)$. Specially, we shall concentrate on curved phase spaces of constant curvature: complex projective spaces $\mathbb{CP}^{N-1} = SU(N)/U(N-1)$ and open complex balls $\mathbb{CD}^{N-1} = SU(1, N-1)/U(N-1)$, with positive and negative curvature, respectively.

We shall show that, similar to the *spin-statistics theorem* in quantum field theory relating the spin of a particle to the statistics obeyed by that particle, a sort of *curvature-statistics connection* can also be established in our context. In fact, a degenerated ground state (actually, a coherent state of zero modes) radiates as a black body for second-quantized field theories on curved phase spaces of negative curvature, while the quantum statistics of the radiation is of Fermi-Dirac (FD) type for positive curvature.

The organization of the paper is as follows. In Sec. 2 we describe the general construction of a G -invariant quantum many-body system as a second quantization on a group G and the spontaneous breakdown of G to G_0 , the stability subgroup of the degenerated vacuum. In Sec. 3 we discuss quantum mechanics on coset spaces of pseudo-unitary groups $U(N_+, N_-)$ and its relation to non-linear sigma-models. We introduce a parametrization of general pseudo-unitary groups and describe their coset spaces and unitary irreducible representations, using the machinery of Coherent States [8, 9]. They are the ingredients to calculate probability distributions, average energies and the thermodynamics of the excited ground state in Sec. 4, whose statistics turns out to generalize the usual FD and BE expressions, depending on the curvature. The last Section is devoted to some comments on the vacuum (*dark*) energy and its

implications in cosmology.

2 The general context

Let $\mathcal{G} = \{X_\alpha, \alpha = 0, 1, 2, \dots, l\}$ be the (Lie) algebra of observables of a given quantum system, among which we highlight X_0 as the Hamiltonian operator. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be the (Hilbert) carrier space of a unitary irreducible representation U of the Lie group G . Let us assume that the energy spectrum is discrete and bounded from below, that is, there is a vacuum vector $|0\rangle$ whose energy E_0 we set to zero, i.e.

$$X_0|0\rangle = 0. \quad (1)$$

Let $B(\mathcal{H}) = \{|n\rangle, n = 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ be a (finite or infinite) orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}$ made up of energy eigenvectors, $X_0|n\rangle = E_n|n\rangle$.

An important ingredient to construct a G -invariant quantum field theory, as a second-quantized (many-particle) theory, will be the irreducible matrix coefficients

$$U_{mn}(x) \equiv \langle m|U(x)|n\rangle, \quad (2)$$

of the representation $U(x) = e^{i\sum_\alpha x^\alpha X_\alpha}$ of G in the orthonormal basis $B(\mathcal{H})$, where $\{x^\alpha \in \mathbb{R}, \alpha = 0, \dots, \dim(G) - 1\}$ stands for a coordinate system in G .

Given the Fourier expansion, in energy modes, of a state

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{n=0} a_n |n\rangle, \quad (3)$$

the Fourier coefficients a_n (resp. $a_n^\dagger$) are promoted to annihilation (resp. creation) operators of energy modes E_n in the second quantized theory, with commutation relations $[a_n, a_m^\dagger] = \delta_{n,m}$. The (finite) action of G on annihilation operators is:

$$a_m \rightarrow a'_m = \sum_{n=0} U_{mn}(x) a_n, \quad (4)$$

together with the conjugated expression for creation operators. The infinitesimal generators of this finite action are the second quantized version, $\hat{X}_\alpha$, of the basic observables X_α . They have the following explicit expression in terms of creation and annihilation operators:

$$\hat{X}_\alpha = -i \sum_{m,n=0} a_m^\dagger \left. \frac{\partial U_{mn}(x)}{\partial x^\alpha} \right|_{x=0} a_n. \quad (5)$$

For example, since $|n\rangle$ are energy E_n eigenstates and we have set $E_0 = 0$, the Hamiltonian operator is:

$$\hat{X}_0 = \sum_{n=1} E_n a_n^\dagger a_n. \quad (6)$$

The vacuum $|\hat{0}\rangle$ of the second quantized theory is characterized by being stable under the symmetry group G , i.e. it is annihilated by the symmetry generators

$$\hat{X}_\alpha |\hat{0}\rangle = 0, \quad \alpha = 0, \dots, \dim(G) - 1 \quad (7)$$

and also by a_n , i.e. $a_n|0\rangle = 0, \forall n \geq 0$. Then an orthonormal basis for the Hilbert space of the second quantized theory is constructed by taking the orbit through the vacuum $|\hat{0}\rangle$ of the creation operators $a_n^\dagger$:

$$|q(n_1), \dots, q(n_p)\rangle \equiv \frac{(a_{n_1}^\dagger)^{q(n_1)} \dots (a_{n_p}^\dagger)^{q(n_p)}}{(q(n_1)! \dots q(n_p)!)^{1/2}} |\hat{0}\rangle, \quad (8)$$

where $q(n) \in \mathbb{N}$ denotes the occupation number of the energy level n .

Note that any multi-particle state (8) made up of an arbitrary content of *zero modes*, like

$$|\theta\rangle \equiv \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} \theta_q (a_0^\dagger)^q |\hat{0}\rangle, \quad \theta_q \in \mathbb{C}, \quad (9)$$

has zero total energy, i.e. $\hat{X}_0|\theta\rangle = 0$, since $[\hat{X}_0, a_0] = 0$. It also verifies $a_n|\theta\rangle = 0, \forall n > 0$. Let us denote by $G_0 \subset G$ the maximal stability (isotropy) subgroup of this degenerated ground state $|\theta\rangle$, of which the Hamiltonian $\hat{X}_0$ is one of its generators.

Actually, the operator a_0 conmmutes with the unbroken symmetry generators $\hat{X}_\alpha^{(0)} \in \mathcal{G}_0$ (the Lie algebra of G_0) and the creation operators:

$$[a_0, \hat{X}_\alpha^{(0)}] = 0 = [a_0, a_n^\dagger], \quad \forall n > 0, \quad (10)$$

so that, by Schur's Lemma, a_0 behaves as (a multiple of) the identity operator in the broken theory. That is, it is natural to demand a_0 to leave the G_0 -invariant vacuum (9) stable, which implies that:

$$a_0|\theta\rangle = \theta|\theta\rangle \Rightarrow |\theta\rangle = e^{\theta a_0^\dagger - \bar{\theta} a_0} |\hat{0}\rangle. \quad (11)$$

Thus, the vacuum of our (spontaneously) broken theory will be a *coherent state of zero modes* (see [8] and [9] for a thorough exposition on coherent states).

Now we show that a general unitary symmetry transformation (4), which incorporates broken symmetry generators in G/G_0 , produces a “rearrangement” of this pseudo-vacuum $|\theta\rangle$ and causes it to radiate. In other words, we can associate a *quantum statistical ensemble* with the excited (or, let us say, “polarized”) vacuum

$$|\theta'\rangle \equiv e^{\theta a_0^\dagger - \bar{\theta} a_0} |\hat{0}\rangle, \quad (12)$$

as follows.

The average number of particles with energy E_n can be computed as the expectation value:

$$N_n(x) = \langle \theta' | a_n^\dagger a_n | \theta' \rangle = |\theta|^2 |U_{0n}(x)|^2, \quad (13)$$

hence, $|\theta|^2$ is the total average of particles of this quantum statistical ensemble. In the same way, the probability $P_n(q, x)$ of observing q particles with energy E_n in $|\theta'\rangle$ can be calculated as:

$$P_n(q, x) = |\langle q(n) | \theta' \rangle|^2 = \frac{e^{-|\theta|^2}}{q!} |\theta|^{2q} |U_{0n}(x)|^{2q} = \frac{e^{-|\theta|^2}}{q!} N_n^q(x). \quad (14)$$

Therefore, the relative probability of observing a state with total energy E in the excited vacuum $|\theta'\rangle$ is:

$$P(E) = \sum_{\substack{q_0, \dots, q_k : \\ \sum_{n=0}^k E_n q_n = E}} \prod_{n=0}^k P_n(q_n, x). \quad (15)$$

For the cases studied in this paper, this distribution function can be factorized as $P(E) = \Omega(E)e^{-\tau E}$, where $\Omega(E)$ is a relative weight proportional to the number of states with energy E and the factor $e^{-\tau E}$ fits this weight properly to a temperature $T = k_B/\tau$.

We shall be primarily interested in the mean values of the basic observables (5). They can be calculated as:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{X}_\alpha &\equiv \langle \theta' | \hat{X}_\alpha | \theta' \rangle = -i|\theta|^2 \sum_{m,n=0} U_{0m}(x) \frac{\partial U_{mn}(0)}{\partial x^\alpha} \bar{U}_{0n}(x) \\ &= -i|\theta|^2 \left(U(x) \frac{\partial U(0)}{\partial x^\alpha} U^\dagger(x) \right)_{00}.\end{aligned}\quad (16)$$

In particular, the mean energy is simply:

$$\mathcal{X}_0 = |\theta|^2 \sum_{n=1} |U_{0n}(x)|^2 E_n. \quad (17)$$

We shall see that $\mathcal{X}_0$ generalizes the usual FD and BE expressions for the compact $G = U(N)$ and non-compact $G = U(1, N-1)$ cases, respectively.

3 Quantum mechanics on cosets of $U(N_+, N_-)$

We shall focus on (pseudo-)unitary groups:

$$G = U(N_+, N_-) = \{U \in M_{N \times N}(\mathbb{C}) / U \Lambda U^\dagger = U^\dagger \Lambda U = \Lambda, N = N_+ + N_-\}, \quad (18)$$

i.e., groups of complex $N \times N$ matrices U that leave invariant the indefinite metric

$$\Lambda = \text{diag}(1, \overset{N_+}{\cdot\cdot\cdot}, 1, -1, \overset{N_-}{\cdot\cdot\cdot}, -1).$$

As the Lie-algebra $\mathcal{G}$ generators we can choose the step operators X_α^β ,

$$\mathcal{G} = u(N_+, N_-) = \langle X_\alpha^\beta, \text{ with } (X_\alpha^\beta)^\nu_\mu \equiv \delta_\alpha^\nu \delta_\mu^\beta; \alpha, \beta, \mu, \nu = 1, \dots, N \rangle, \quad (19)$$

fulfilling the commutation relations:

$$\left[X_{\alpha_1}^{\beta_1}, X_{\alpha_2}^{\beta_2} \right] = \delta_{\alpha_1}^{\beta_2} X_{\alpha_2}^{\beta_1} - \delta_{\alpha_2}^{\beta_1} X_{\alpha_1}^{\beta_2}, \quad (20)$$

and the usual orthogonality relations:

$$\text{Tr}(X_\alpha^\beta X_\gamma^\rho) = \delta_\alpha^\rho \delta_\gamma^\beta. \quad (21)$$

The Cartan (maximal Abelian) subalgebra $\mathcal{C} = u(1)^N$ is made of diagonal operators

$$\mathcal{C} = \langle X_\alpha^\alpha, \alpha = 1, \dots, N \rangle. \quad (22)$$

We shall choose our Hamiltonian X_0 to be a linear combination of Cartan generators

$$X_0 = \sum_{\alpha=1}^N \lambda_\alpha X_\alpha^\alpha, \quad (23)$$

and the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ to be a lowest-weight unitary irreducible representation of G . For unitary irreducible representations of G we have the conjugation relation (summation over repeated indices will be used where no confusion arises):

$$X_{\alpha\beta}^\dagger = X_{\beta\alpha}, \quad X_{\alpha\beta} \equiv \Lambda_{\alpha\gamma} X_\beta^\gamma, \quad (24)$$

which distinguishes between compact and non-compact cases (positive-definite and indefinite metrics Λ , respectively).

3.1 Non-linear sigma-models on cosets of $U(N_+, N_-)$

For those readers who prefer the Lagrangian picture to a group-theoretic/algebraic viewpoint, we shall consider, for example, the case of G -invariant non-linear sigma-models described by the *partial-trace* Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(U, \dot{U}) &= \rho_1 \text{Tr}_{G^0}(\vartheta^L) + \rho_2 \text{Tr}_{G/G^0}(\vartheta^L)^2 \equiv \rho_1 \text{Tr}(X_0 \vartheta^L) + \rho_2 \text{Tr}([iX_0, \vartheta^L])^2 \\ &= \rho_1 \sum_{\alpha=1}^N \lambda_\alpha \vartheta_\alpha^\alpha + \rho_2 \sum_{\alpha, \beta=1}^N (\lambda_\alpha - \lambda_\beta)^2 \vartheta_\beta^\alpha \vartheta_\alpha^\beta, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where

$$\vartheta^L = iU^{-1}\dot{U} = \vartheta_\alpha^\beta X_\beta^\alpha, \quad \vartheta_\beta^\alpha = \bar{\vartheta}_\alpha^\beta \quad (26)$$

stands for the canonical left-invariant 1-form on G and $\rho_{1,2}$ are coupling constants. This Lagrangian is obviously left-invariant under rigid (global) transformations

$$U \rightarrow U'U, \quad \forall U' \in G \quad (27)$$

and right-invariant under local (gauge) transformations

$$U \rightarrow UU_0(t), \quad U_0(t) \in G^0, \quad (28)$$

belonging to the isotropy subgroup $G^0 \subset G$ of X_0 under the adjoint action $X_0 \rightarrow UX_0U^{-1}$ of the group G on its Lie algebra $\mathcal{G}$. In general, we shall have $G^0 \subset G_0$, where G_0 is the maximal stability (isotropy) subgroup of the degenerated vacuum $|\theta\rangle$, whose generators fulfil (10).

Let us see some examples for $G = U(N)$:

1. For the case $\lambda_\alpha \neq \lambda_\beta, \forall \alpha, \beta = 1 \dots, N$, the unbroken symmetry group is $G^0 = U(1)^N$ and the Lagrangian (25) describes a motion on the coset (*flag manifold*) $\mathbb{F}_{N-1} = G/G^0 = U(N)/U(1)^N$.
2. For $\lambda_\alpha = 0, \forall \alpha > 1$, the gauge group is $G^0 = U(N-1) \times U(1)$ and (25) describes a motion on the *complex projective* space $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1} = U(N)/U(N-1) \times U(1)$. Eventually, we shall restrict ourselves to this case and set, for example,

$$X_0 = \lambda X_1^1, \quad (29)$$

up to constant (zero-point energy) addends –see later on Eqs. (57) and (64).

3. For other choices like:

$$0 = \lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \cdots = \lambda_{N_1} \neq \lambda_{N_1+1} \neq \cdots \neq \lambda_{N-N_2} = \cdots = \lambda_N = 0$$

the unbroken symmetry group is $G^0 = U(N_1) \times U(N_2) \times U(1)$ and (25) describes a motion on the *complex Grassmannian* manifold $\mathbb{C}G(N_1, N_2) = U(N)/U(N_1) \times U(N_2) \times U(1)$ (see next Section for suitable coordinate systems on these coset spaces).

At the quantum level, gauge transformations like (28) induce constraints on wave functions $\psi(U)$. Let us denote by L_β^α the *left-invariant* vector fields that generate the gauge right-translations (28). They are dual to the left-invariant 1-forms $\vartheta^L = iU^{-1}dU = \vartheta_\beta^\alpha X_\alpha^\beta$, so that $\vartheta_\beta^\alpha(L_\sigma^\gamma) = \delta_\sigma^\alpha \delta_\beta^\gamma$. For the case of $\mathbb{F}_{N-1} = G/G^0 = U(N)/U(1)^N$, constraint equations attached to the gauge invariance (28) can be written as:

$$L_\alpha^\alpha \psi = -2S_\alpha \psi, \quad \alpha = 1, \dots, N, \quad (30)$$

where $(S_1, \dots, S_N) = S$ denote N (half-integer) quantum numbers (“spin labels”) characterizing the representation. For complex-projective $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1} = U(N)/U(N-1) \times U(1)$ spaces and open complex balls $\mathbb{C}D^{N-1} = U(1, N-1)/U(N-1) \times U(1)$, constraint equations read:

$$\begin{aligned} L_1^1 \psi &= -2S_1 \psi, \\ L_\alpha^\beta \psi &= 0, \quad \forall \alpha, \beta > 1, \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where now there is only one quantum number S_1 characterizing the representation. Constraints for other cosets follow similar guidelines.

Moreover, we shall restrict ourselves to the Lagrangian (25) for coupling constants $\rho_1 = \rho$ and $\rho_2 = 0$ and we shall work in a holomorphic picture, which means that constrained wave functions (30) will be further restricted by:

$$L_\alpha^\beta \psi = 0, \quad \forall \alpha > \beta = 1, \dots, N-1. \quad (32)$$

Those readers familiar with Geometric Quantization [10, 11] will identify the constraint equations (30) and (32) as *polarization* conditions (see also [12] for a Group Approach to Quantization scheme and [13] for the extension of first-order polarizations to higher-order polarizations), intended to reduce the representation of G on wave functions ψ on G/G^0 . Also, the constraints (30) and (32) are exactly the defining relations of a lowest-weight representation. Actually, left-invariant vector fields L_α^β satisfy (creation and annihilation) harmonic oscillator commutation relations,

$$[L_\alpha^\beta, L_\beta^\alpha] = 2(S_\beta - S_\alpha), \quad (33)$$

when acting on constrained states (30), the constraint (32) then defining a holomorphic (or anti-holomorphic) representation.

The quantum operators of our theory will be the *right-invariant* vector fields R_β^α that generate the left-symmetry translations (27). They are dual to the right-invariant 1-forms $\vartheta^R = idUU^{-1} = \tilde{\vartheta}_\beta^\alpha X_\alpha^\beta$, so that $\tilde{\vartheta}_\beta^\alpha(R_\sigma^\gamma) = \delta_\sigma^\alpha \delta_\beta^\gamma$. We shall continue using the notation X_β^α , instead of R_β^α , for our operators, in the hope that no confusion arises.

Before constructing the corresponding Hilbert space, let us show how to put coordinates x_β^α on G .

3.2 Complex coordinates on $U(N_+, N_-)$

We shall exemplify our construction with the cases of the compact $G = U(4)$ and non-compact $G = U(1, 3)$ groups, in a unified manner.

In order to put coordinates on G , the ideal choice is the Bruhat decomposition [14] for the coset space (flag manifold) $\mathbb{F} = G/T$, where we denote $T = U(1)^N$ the maximal torus. We shall introduce a local complex parametrization of $\mathbb{F}$ by means of the isomorphism $G/T = G^\mathbb{C}/B$, where $G^\mathbb{C} \equiv GL(N, \mathbb{C})$ is the complexification of G , and B is the Borel subgroup of upper triangular matrices. In one direction, the element $[U]_T \in G/T$ is mapped to $[U]_B \in G^\mathbb{C}/B$. For example, for $G = U(4)$ we have:

$$[U]_T = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 & u_2 & u_3 & u_4 \\ u_1^1 & u_2^1 & u_3^1 & u_4^1 \\ u_1^2 & u_2^2 & u_3^2 & u_4^2 \\ u_1^3 & u_2^3 & u_3^3 & u_4^3 \\ u_1^4 & u_2^4 & u_3^4 & u_4^4 \end{pmatrix} \longrightarrow [U]_B = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & x_3 & x_4 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ x_1^2 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ x_1^3 & x_2^3 & 1 & 0 \\ x_1^4 & x_2^4 & x_3^4 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (34)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} x_1^2 &= \frac{u_1^2}{u_1^1}, \quad x_1^3 = \frac{u_1^3}{u_1^1}, \quad x_1^4 = \frac{u_1^4}{u_1^1}, \\ x_2^3 &= \frac{u_1^1 u_2^3 - u_2^1 u_1^3}{u_1^1 u_2^2 - u_2^1 u_1^2}, \quad x_2^4 = \frac{u_1^1 u_2^4 - u_2^1 u_1^4}{u_1^1 u_2^2 - u_2^1 u_1^2}, \\ x_3^4 &= \frac{u_1^3(u_1^2 u_2^4 - u_2^2 u_1^4) - u_2^3(u_1^1 u_2^4 - u_2^1 u_1^4) + u_3^4(u_1^1 u_2^2 - u_2^1 u_1^2)}{u_1^3(u_1^2 u_2^3 - u_2^2 u_1^3) - u_2^3(u_1^1 u_2^3 - u_2^1 u_1^3) + u_3^3(u_1^1 u_2^2 - u_2^1 u_1^2)}, \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

provides a complex coordinatization $\{x_\beta^\alpha, \alpha > \beta = 1, 2, 3\}$ of nearly all of the 12-dimensional complex flag manifold $\mathbb{F}_3 = U(4)/U(1)^4$, missing only a lower-dimensional subspace; indeed, these coordinates are defined where the denominators are non-zero.

In the other direction, i.e. from $G^\mathbb{C}/B$ to G/T , one uses the Iwasawa decomposition: any element $W \in G^\mathbb{C}$ may be factorized as $W = VL, V \in G, L \in B$ in a unique manner, up to torus elements $t \in T$, the Cartan subgroup of diagonal matrices $t = \text{diag}(x_1^1, x_2^2, x_3^3, x_4^4)$, the coordinates of which x_α^α (phases) can be calculated in terms of the arguments of the upper angular minors of order α of $U \in G$ as

$$x_1^1 = \left(\frac{u_1^1}{\bar{u}_1^1}\right)^{1/2}, \quad x_2^2 = (x_1^1)^{-1} \left(\frac{u_1^1 u_2^2 - u_2^1 u_{21}^1}{\bar{u}_1^1 \bar{u}_2^2 - \bar{u}_2^1 \bar{u}_{21}^1}\right)^{1/2}, \dots \quad (36)$$

The Iwasawa decomposition in this case may be proved by means of the Gram-Schmidt orthonormalization process: regard any $[U]_B \in G^\mathbb{C}/B$ [like the one in (34)] as a juxtaposition of N column vectors $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$. Then one obtains orthogonal vectors $\{v_\alpha\}$ in the usual way:

$$v'_\alpha = x_\alpha - (x_\alpha, v_{\alpha-1})v_{\alpha-1} - \dots - (x_\alpha, v_1)v_1, \quad v_\alpha = v'_\alpha / (\Lambda^{\alpha\alpha}(v'_\alpha, v'_\alpha))^{1/2}, \quad (37)$$

where $(x_\alpha, v_\beta) \equiv \bar{x}_\alpha^\mu \Lambda_{\mu\nu} v_\beta^\nu$ denotes a scalar product in $\mathbb{C}^N$ with metric Λ . The explicit expression of (37) for the simple cases of the compact (positive sign) $U(2)$ and non-compact $U(1, 1)$ (negative sign) groups is:

$$v_1^\pm = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_1^\pm(\bar{x}, x)}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ x_1^1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad v_2^\pm = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_1^\pm(\bar{x}, x)}} \begin{pmatrix} \mp x_2^1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad x_2^1 \equiv \bar{x}_1^2, \quad (38)$$

where we define the *length*:

$$\Delta_1^\pm(\bar{x}, x) \equiv 1 \pm |x_1^2|^2. \quad (39)$$

The more involved case of $U(4)$ can be found in [7] and that of $U(2, 2)$ in [15]. We shall give here only the explicit expressions of the lengths for $U(4)$ (positive sign) and $U(1, 3)$ (negative sign):

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_1^\pm(\bar{x}, x) &= 1 \pm |x_1^2|^2 \pm |x_1^3|^2 \pm |x_1^4|^2, \\ \Delta_2^\pm(\bar{x}, x) &= 1 \pm |x_2^3 x_1^4 - x_2^4 x_1^3|^2 + |x_2^3|^2 + |x_2^4|^2 \pm |x_2^3 x_1^2 - x_1^3|^2 \pm |x_2^4 x_1^2 - x_1^4|^2 \\ \Delta_3^\pm(\bar{x}, x) &= 1 + |x_3^4|^2 + |x_2^4 - x_3^4 x_2^3|^2 \pm |x_1^4 + x_3^4 x_2^3 x_1^2 - x_2^4 x_1^2 - x_3^4 x_1^3|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

These quantities will play an important role in the calculation of irreducible matrix coefficients (2) through the Bergmann's kernel. They can be computed as the upper angular minors of order $\alpha = 1, 2, 3$ of the matrix $\Lambda[U]_B^\dagger \Lambda[U]_B$, with $[U]_B$ given in (34) and $\Lambda = \text{diag}(1, \pm 1, \pm 1, \pm 1)$.

Any unitary matrix $U \in G$ in the present patch (which contains the identity element, $x_\beta^\alpha = 0, \forall \alpha \neq \beta, x_\alpha^\alpha = 1$) can be written in minimal coordinates $x_\beta^\alpha, \alpha, \beta = 1, \dots, N$ (with the definition of $x_\beta^\alpha = \bar{x}_\alpha^\beta, \forall \alpha < \beta$) as the product $U = Vt$ of an element V of the base (flag) $\mathbb{F}_{N-1}$ times an element t of the fibre $T = U(1)^N$. Namely, for $U_+ \in U(2)$ and $U_- \in U(1, 1)$ we have simply:

$$U_\pm(x) = Vt = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_1^\pm(x, \bar{x})}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \mp x_2^1 \\ x_2^1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_1^1 & 0 \\ 0 & x_2^2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (41)$$

3.3 Unitary irreducible representations and coherent states of $U(N_+, N_-)$

We have shown how to compute the matrix elements of a general (pseudo-)unitary transformation $U(x) \in U(N_+, N_-)$ in the fundamental representation. Now, let us show how to proceed for more general (“higher-spin”) unitary irreducible representations. The group $U(N_+, N_-)$ is non-compact so that, unlike the case of $U(N)$, all its unitary irreducible representations are infinite-dimensional. Here, we shall restrict ourselves to representations of the discrete series where each carrier space $\mathcal{H}_S$ is labelled by the quantum numbers (‘generalized spin’) $S = (S_1, \dots, S_N), S_\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}/2$ of Eq. (30) and is spanned by an orthonormal basis $B(\mathcal{H}_S) = \{|S, n\rangle\}$, made of eigenstates of the Cartan subalgebra (22), i.e.

$$X_\alpha^\alpha |S, n\rangle = (n(\alpha) - 2S_\alpha) |S, n\rangle, \quad (42)$$

where the index n denotes an integral upper-triangular $N \times N$ matrix with entries $n_\alpha^\beta, \alpha > \beta = 1, \dots, N-1$ and

$$n(\alpha) \equiv \sum_{\beta > \alpha} n_\beta^\alpha - \sum_{\beta < \alpha} n_\alpha^\beta \quad (43)$$

(see [16] for more details). The range of the entries n_α^β of n depends on the set of “spin” indices $\{S_\alpha, \alpha = 1, \dots, N\}$.

Constrained wave functions (30,32) can be arranged in general as the product (see [17] for a general proof):

$$\psi_s(x) = W_s(x) \phi(x_\beta^\alpha), \quad \alpha < \beta \quad (44)$$

of an arbitrary holomorphic function $\phi(x_\beta^\alpha), \alpha < \beta$ [which is the general solution of Eqs. (30) and (32) for $S_\alpha = 0$], times a lowest-weight vector W_s (“vacuum”), which is a particular solution

of Eqs. (30) and (32) for $S_\alpha \neq 0$. A possible choice of W_s can be given in terms of lengths like (40) as (see [16] for more details):

$$W_s(x) \equiv \prod_{\beta=1}^N \frac{1}{t_\beta^{2s_\beta} \Delta_\beta(\bar{x}, x)^{s_\beta}}, \quad (45)$$

where we have defined:

$$\Delta_N \equiv 1, \quad t_\beta \equiv x_\beta^\beta \bar{x}_{\beta+1}^{\beta+1}, \quad t_N \equiv \prod_{\beta=1}^N x_\beta^\beta, \quad s_\beta \equiv S_\beta - S_{\beta+1}, \quad s_N \equiv \sum_{\beta=1}^N S_\beta. \quad (46)$$

The sign of s_β is always strictly positive except for $s_{N+} \in \mathbb{Z}^-/2$, in order to ensure the existence of a finite scalar product (see, e.g., [16]). In bracket notation we shall write:

$$W_s(x) \equiv \langle s, x | s, 0 \rangle = \langle s, 0 | U^\dagger(x) | s, 0 \rangle, \quad \psi_s(x) \equiv \langle s, x | \psi \rangle. \quad (47)$$

Here we are implicitly making use of the Coherent-States machinery (see e.g. [8, 9]). Actually, we are denoting by $|s, x\rangle \equiv U(x)|s, 0\rangle$ the set of vectors in the orbit of the vacuum $|s, 0\rangle$ (the lowest-weight vector) under the action of the group G (this set is called a family of *covariant coherent states* in the literature [8, 9]). Given that $|s, n\rangle$ are eigenstates of the Cartan subalgebra (22), the Cartan (isotropy) subgroup $T = U(1)^N$ stabilizes the vacuum vector $|s, 0\rangle$ up to multiplicative phase factors (characters of T) which are irrelevant for the calculation of the modulus of the matrix coefficients (2). Thus, we shall make use of the factorization $U = Vt, V \in \mathbb{F}_{N-1}, t \in T$ in (41) and we shall restrict ourselves to classes of coherent states modulo T (usually referred to as Gilmore-Perelomov coherent states), that is, we shall set $t = 1$.

Eventually, we are interested in the calculation of the irreducible matrix coefficients (2). For general pseudo-unitary groups $U(N_+, N_-)$, this task is quite unwieldy. Fortunately, we are just interested in the computation of the matrix elements

$$U_{0n}^{(s)}(x) = \langle s, 0 | U(x) | s, n \rangle, \quad (48)$$

the squared modulus of which gives the average number of particles with energy E_n (13) in the excited vacuum (12), up to a constant factor. For this, we can take advantage of the *coherent state overlap* or reproducing (normalized Bergmann's) kernel $\langle s, x | s, x' \rangle = \langle s, 0 | U(x)^\dagger U(x') | s, 0 \rangle$, which can be expressed in terms of the upper-angular minors of $\Lambda[U]_B^\dagger \Lambda[U]_B$ and $\Lambda[U]_B^\dagger \Lambda[U]_B'$ as follows (see e.g. [16, 8, 9] for more details):

$$\langle s, x | s, x' \rangle = \prod_{\beta=1}^{N-1} \frac{\Delta_\beta(\bar{x}, x')^{2s_\beta}}{\Delta_\beta(\bar{x}, x)^{s_\beta} \Delta_\beta(\bar{x}', x')^{s_\beta}}. \quad (49)$$

For example, for $U(2)$ and $U(1, 1)$ the expression (49) reads:

$$\langle s, x | s, x' \rangle_\pm = \frac{(1 \pm \bar{x}_1^2 x_1'^2)^{\pm 2s}}{(1 \pm |x_1^2|^2)^{\pm s} (1 \pm |x_1'^2|^2)^{\pm s}}, \quad s = 1/2, 1, 3/2, \dots \quad (50)$$

where the upper sign corresponds to $U(2)$ and the lower one to $U(1, 1)$. The coherent state overlap (49) will play the role of a “generating function” for our matrix elements (48). In fact,

inserting the resolution of unity $I = \sum_n |s, n\rangle\langle s, n|$ in the coherent state overlap (49), we arrive at:

$$\langle s, x|s, x'\rangle = \sum_n \langle s, 0|U(x)^\dagger|s, n\rangle\langle s, n|U(x')|s, 0\rangle. \quad (51)$$

We can easily identify the addends of this series in the expansion of the upper-angular minors $\Delta_\beta(x', \bar{x})$ in (49). For example, for $U(2)$ and $U(1, 1)$, the expansion of (50),

$$\begin{aligned} \langle s, x|s, x'\rangle_+ &= \frac{\sum_{n=0}^{2s} \binom{2s}{n} (\bar{x}_1^2 x_1'^2)^n}{(1 + |x_1^2|^2)^s (1 + |x_1'^2|^2)^s}, \\ \langle s, x|s, x'\rangle_- &= \frac{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \binom{2s+n-1}{n} (\bar{x}_1^2 x_1'^2)^n}{(1 - |x_1^2|^2)^{-s} (1 - |x_1'^2|^2)^{-s}}, \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

gives

$$\begin{aligned} U_{0n}^{(s)}(x)_+ &= \langle s, 0|U_+(x)|s, n\rangle = \frac{\binom{2s}{n}^{1/2} (x_1^2)^n}{(1 + |x_1^2|^2)^s}, \\ U_{0n}^{(s)}(x)_- &= \langle s, 0|U_-(x)|s, n\rangle = \frac{\binom{2s+n-1}{n}^{1/2} (x_1^2)^n}{(1 - |x_1^2|^2)^{-s}}, \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

for the matrix coefficients (48). An alternative way of arriving at these expressions is by exponentiating the usual action

$$\begin{aligned} J_0|s, n\rangle &= (n - \kappa s)|s, n\rangle, \\ J_+|s, n\rangle &= \sqrt{(n+1)(2s - \kappa n)}|s, n+1\rangle, \\ J_-|s, n\rangle &= \sqrt{n(2s - \kappa(n-1))}|s, n-1\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

of the $SU(2)$ ($\kappa = +1$) and $SU(1, 1)$ ($\kappa = -1$) generators $J_+ = X_2^1$, $J_- = \kappa X_1^2$, $J_0 = (X_1^1 - X_2^2)/2$, with the standard commutation relations:

$$[J_+, J_-] = 2\kappa J_0, \quad [J_0, J_\pm] = \pm J_\pm. \quad (55)$$

Actually, any group element $U(x) \in G_\kappa/T$ can be represented as:

$$U_\kappa(x) = e^{\zeta J_+ - \bar{\zeta} J_-}, \quad x_1^2 = \frac{\zeta}{|\zeta|} \tan_\kappa |\zeta|, \quad (56)$$

where we denote by $\tan_1 = \tan$ and $\tan_{-1} = \tanh$, the standard trigonometric and hyperbolic tangents. Using the expressions (54-56) one can recover again, after some algebra, the result (53).

According to the general prescription given in (29), our Hamiltonian operator for $\mathbb{CP}^1 = U(2)/U(1)^2$ and $\mathbb{CB}^1 = U(1, 1)/U(1)^2$ will be:

$$X_0^\kappa = \hbar\omega(J_0 + \kappa sI) = \hbar\omega(X_1^1 - \Xi_\kappa), \quad \omega \equiv \lambda/\hbar, \quad (57)$$

where $\Xi_\kappa \equiv X_1^1 + X_2^2$ (the zero-point ‘dark’- energy operator) stands for the linear (trace) Casimir operator fulfilling

$$\Xi_\kappa|s, n\rangle = -2\kappa s|s, n\rangle. \quad (58)$$

The reason to subtract the ‘dark’ energy Ξ_κ from our Hamiltonian operator (29) is in order to fulfil our initial requirement (1) that the vacuum state $|s, 0\rangle$ has no energy, $E_0 = 0$. In fact:

$$X_0^\kappa |s, n\rangle = E_n |s, n\rangle, \quad E_n = \hbar\omega n \quad (59)$$

[remember also the Eqs. (42) and (43)]. We have introduced the Planck constant $\hbar$ and the frequency $\omega = \lambda/\hbar$ motivated by the spectrum (59), which suggests that we are dealing with a generalized harmonic oscillator; actually, the standard harmonic oscillator representation is recovered in (54) for $\kappa = 0$ (zero curvature).

This algorithm can be straightforwardly extended to higher-dimensional pseudo-unitary groups and higher-dimensional cosets, although the resulting expressions are much more involved. We shall concentrate ourselves in the case of coherent states of $U(N)$ and $U(1, N-1)$ parametrized by points of the coset spaces $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1} = U(N)/U(N-1) \times U(1)$ and $\mathbb{C}D^{N-1} = U(1, N-1)/U(N-1) \times U(1)$, respectively. This choice corresponds to wave functions constrained by (31), that is, to picking $s_\alpha = 0, \forall \alpha > 1$ in (49) and $s_1 = \pm s, s \in \mathbb{Z}^+/2$, for $U(N)$ and $U(1, N-1)$, respectively. More explicitly:

$$\langle s, x | s, x' \rangle_\pm = \frac{\Delta_1(\bar{x}, x')^{\pm 2s}}{\Delta_1(\bar{x}, x)^{\pm s} \Delta_1(\bar{x}', x')^{\pm s}} = \frac{(1 \pm \sum_{\alpha=2}^N \bar{x}_1^\alpha x_1'^{\alpha})^{\pm 2s}}{(1 \pm \sum_{\alpha=2}^N |x_1^\alpha|^2)^{\pm s} (1 \pm \sum_{\alpha=2}^N |x_1'^\alpha|^2)^{\pm s}}. \quad (60)$$

Expanding the numerator of the last fraction, like in (52), we arrive at the matrix elements:

$$\begin{aligned} U_{0n}^{(s)}(x)_+ &= \langle s, 0 | U_+(x) | s, n \rangle = \frac{\left(\frac{2s!}{\prod_{\alpha=1}^N n_\alpha!} \right)^{1/2} \prod_{\alpha=2}^N (x_1^\alpha)^{n_\alpha}}{(1 + \sum_{\alpha=2}^N |x_1^\alpha|^2)^s}, \\ U_{0n}^{(s)}(x)_- &= \langle s, 0 | U_-(x) | s, n \rangle = \frac{\left(\frac{(2s+n_1-1)!}{(2s-1)! \prod_{\alpha=2}^N n_\alpha!} \right)^{1/2} \prod_{\alpha=2}^N (x_1^\alpha)^{n_\alpha}}{(1 - \sum_{\alpha=2}^N |x_1^\alpha|^2)^{-s}}, \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

where now $n = (n_1, \dots, n_N)$ [or $(n_1^1, \dots, n_N^1)$ in the notation of Eqs. (42,43)] is an integral vector satisfying the constraint

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^N n_\alpha = 2s \quad (62)$$

for $U(N)$, and

$$\sum_{\alpha=2}^N n_\alpha = n_1, \quad n_1 \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (63)$$

for $U(1, N-1)$ (see Ref. [18] for other constructions of coherent states on $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$ and $\mathbb{C}D^{N-1}$).

The Hamiltonian operator is again

$$X_0^\kappa = \hbar\omega(X_1^1 - \Xi_\kappa), \quad (64)$$

where now $\Xi_\kappa \equiv \sum_{\alpha=1}^N X_\alpha^\alpha$ (the linear Casimir operator). The energy spectrum is:

$$X_0^\kappa |s, n\rangle = E_n |s, n\rangle, \quad E_n = \hbar\omega \sum_{\alpha=2}^N n_\alpha. \quad (65)$$

This choice fulfils again our prerequisite (1).

4 Thermal vacuum radiation: generalized quantum statistics

Let us show how to associate a thermal bath with the excited vacuum (12). We shall restrict ourselves to curved phase spaces of constant curvature (complex projective spaces $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$ and open complex balls $\mathbb{C}B^{N-1}$). We shall compute the mean energy (17) and show that it matches generalized FD and BE statistics, depending on the curvature, recovering the traditional cases for $N = 2$.

4.1 Broken $U(1, 1)$ symmetry and BE statistics

The unbroken symmetry generators (10) for this case are

$$\mathcal{G}_0 = \langle \hat{X}_0, \hat{J}_- \rangle,$$

which generate affine or similitude transformations. The group G_0 leaves stable the vacuum (11) of the spontaneously broken theory, that is, $\hat{X}_0|\theta\rangle = 0, \hat{J}_-|\theta\rangle = 0$, which (we remind) is a coherent state of zero modes. We can think of zero modes as *virtual* particles without (“bright”) energy and as being undetectable (“dark”) by affine observers. However, we shall show that a general symmetry transformation $U(x) \in U(1, 1)$, which incorporates the broken symmetry generator $\hat{J}_+$, produces a “rearrangement” of the affine vacuum $|\theta\rangle$ and makes it to radiate as a black body.

Taking into account the irreducible matrix coefficients (53), the probability $P_n(p, x)$ in Eq. (14) of observing p particles with energy E_n in $|\theta'\rangle$ is:

$$P_n(p, x) = \frac{e^{-|\theta|^2}}{p!} \left(\frac{|\theta|^2 \binom{2s+n-1}{n}}{(1 - |x_1^2|^2)^{-2s}} \right)^p |x_1^2|^{2np}. \quad (66)$$

From (15), we see that the relative probability of observing a state with total energy $E_q = \hbar\omega q$ in the excited vacuum $|\theta'\rangle$ can be factored as:

$$P(E_q) = \Omega(E_q) (|x_1^2|^2)^q, \quad (67)$$

$$\Omega(E_q) = \sum_{\substack{p_0, \dots, p_q \in \mathbb{N} : \\ \sum_{n=0}^q n p_n = q}} e^{-(q+1)|\theta|^2} ((1 - |x_1^2|^2)^s |\theta|)^{2 \sum_{n=0}^q p_n} \prod_{n=0}^q \frac{\binom{2s+n-1}{n}^{p_n}}{p_n!}. \quad (68)$$

We can associate a *thermal bath* with this distribution function by noticing that $\Omega(E_q)$ behaves as a relative weight proportional to the number of states with energy $E_q = \hbar\omega q$; the factor $(|x_1^2|^2)^q < 1$ fits this weight properly to a temperature T as:

$$(|x_1^2|^2)^q = e^{q \log |x_1^2|^2} = e^{-\frac{E_q}{k_B T}}, \quad T \equiv -\frac{\hbar\omega}{k_B \log |x_1^2|^2}. \quad (69)$$

The (finite subgroup of the) conformal group in 1+1-dimensions is $SO(2, 2) \simeq SU(1, 1) \times SU(1, 1)$. Its generators are: Lorentz transformations $M_{\mu\nu}$, space-time translations P_μ , dilations D , and special conformal transformations $K_\mu, \mu = 0, 1$. We could identify, for example, $D = J_0$ (dilations), $P = P_1 = J_-$ (spatial translations) and $K = K_1 = J_+$ (spatial relativistic uniform accelerations). Indeed, they reproduce the standard commutation relations of the

conformal group (Lorentz transformations do not appear because we are restricting ourselves to spatial translations):

$$[K, P] = -2D, \quad [D, K] = K, \quad [D, P] = -P.$$

We could think of special conformal transformations $K \in su(1, 1)$ as transitions to a uniformly relativistic accelerated frame (see e.g. [19] and [5]), so that $T = \frac{\hbar a}{2\pi c k_B}$ is the temperature associated with a given acceleration $a \equiv -2\pi\omega c / \log |x_1^2|^2$.

After some intermediate calculations, the expected value of the total energy in the accelerated vacuum $|\theta'\rangle$, given by Eq. (17), proves to be:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{X}_0 &= |\theta|^2 (1 - |x_1^2|^2)^{2s} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \hbar\omega n \binom{2s+n-1}{n} |x_1^2|^{2n} \\ &= 2s|\theta|^2 \hbar\omega \frac{|x_1^2|^2}{1 - |x_1^2|^2} = 2s|\theta|^2 \frac{\hbar\omega e^{-\hbar\omega/k_B T}}{1 - e^{-\hbar\omega/k_B T}}, \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

which is proportional to the *mean energy per mode* of the BE statistics. In d spatial dimensions, the number of states with frequency between ω and $\omega + d\omega$ is proportional to ω^{d-1} . Thus, for $d = 3$, the spectral distribution of the radiation of the accelerated vacuum $|\theta'\rangle$ is *Planckian*, i.e. $|\theta'\rangle$ radiates as a *black body*. Still, we could have introduced a *chemical potential* μ by setting $|x_1^2|^2 = e^{(\mu - \hbar\omega)/k_B T}$ with the usual restriction for bosons $\mu < \hbar\omega$, in order to preserve the open unit ball condition $|x_1^2| < 1$.

4.2 Broken $U(2)$ symmetry and FD statistics

As for the non-compact case of $U(1, 1)$, we can associate again a thermal bath with the state $|\theta'\rangle$. The difference now is that the factor $|x_1^2|$ is unbounded from above, i.e. $|x_1^2| < \infty$, which means that we have to introduce a non-zero *chemical potential* μ , with no restrictions this time, such that $|x_1^2|^2 = e^{(\mu - \hbar\omega)/k_B T}$, or/and to allow for *negative temperatures*. The expected value of the total energy (17) in the polarized vacuum $|\theta'\rangle$ then proves to be:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{X}_0 &= \langle \theta' | \hat{E} | \theta' \rangle = |\theta|^2 (1 + |x_1^2|^2)^{-2s} \sum_{n=0}^{2s} \hbar\omega n \binom{2s}{n} |x_1^2|^{2n} \\ &= 2s|\theta|^2 \hbar\omega \frac{|x_1^2|^2}{1 + |x_1^2|^2} = 2s|\theta|^2 \frac{\hbar\omega}{1 + e^{(\hbar\omega - \mu)/k_B T}}, \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

which is proportional to the *mean energy per mode* of the FD statistics.

4.3 Generalized quantum statistics

Let us extend the two previous results to higher dimensions, that is, $N > 2$. Taking into account the matrix elements (61) and putting $|x_1^\alpha|^2 \equiv e^{(\mu_\alpha - \hbar\omega)/k_B T}$, $\alpha = 2, \dots, N$, the expression of the probability distribution (15), for the Hamiltonian given by (65), can be again factorized as $P(E) = \Omega(E) e^{-E/k_B T}$. Moreover, the expectation value of the total energy (17) in the excited

vacuum (12) can now be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{X}_0 &= |\theta|^2 \sum'_{n_1, \dots, n_N} \hbar\omega \sum_{\alpha=2}^N n_\alpha |U_{n0}^{(s)}(x)_\pm|^2 \\ &= 2s|\theta|^2 \frac{\hbar\omega e^{(\mu_2 - \hbar\omega)/k_B T} + \dots + \hbar\omega e^{(\mu_N - \hbar\omega)/k_B T}}{1 \pm e^{(\mu_2 - \hbar\omega)/k_B T} \pm \dots \pm e^{(\mu_N - \hbar\omega)/k_B T}},\end{aligned}\quad (72)$$

where $\sum'$ means that the indices n_α are restricted as described in Eqs. (62) and (63). One can recognize here a generalization of the mean energy per mode of the FD and BE statistics for a $N - 1$ compound.

Note that the mean energy (72) could also be written in a nice compact form as:

$$\mathcal{X}_0 = |\theta|^2 X_0 \ln K_B(\bar{x}, x), \quad (73)$$

where

$$X_0 = \hbar\omega \sum_{\alpha=2}^N \bar{x}_1^\alpha \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{x}_1^\alpha} \quad (74)$$

and

$$K_B(\bar{x}, x') = \Delta_1(\bar{x}, x')^{\pm 2s} = \left(1 \pm \sum_{\alpha=2}^N \bar{x}_1^\alpha x_1'^\alpha\right)^{\pm 2s} \quad (75)$$

is the Bergmann's kernel, which coincides with the coherent-state overlap (60) up to normalizing factors.

5 Comments and outlook

We have given a way of finding out the curvature sign ($\pm$) of our phase space by looking at the (FD or BE) nature of the thermal vacuum radiation detected by G/G_0 (or, let us say, ‘accelerated’) observers. Unitary $U(2)$ and pseudo-unitary $U(1,1)$ symmetries are present in many physical systems and, therefore, we feel that our results are not restrictive but deep at the core of many fundamental quantum physical theories.

We also feel tempted to take this ‘curvature-statistics connection’ beyond the scope of this paper and to explore its possible consequences in modern cosmology. Nowadays everybody accepts that the vacuum (dark) energy contributes to the cosmological constant, which affects the expansion of the universe. The vacuum energy density E_0 is related to the vacuum pressure P_0 by the thermodynamic equation of state (see e.g. [1])

$$E_0 = -P_0. \quad (76)$$

This relation is universal: it does not depend on the particular microscopic structure of the quantum vacuum. Negative vacuum energies cause the expansion of empty space to slow down, whereas for $E_0 > 0$ the expansion of empty space tends to speed up. Actual observations indicate that our universe undergoes an accelerated expansion. How is this expansion related to the curvature of the universe?. Let us see what our model says about the connection ‘curvature-vacuum energy’.

We have defined our (first-quantized) Hamiltonian X_0 in terms of only ‘bright’ energy E_n . For example, in (57) and (64) we removed the ‘dark’ (zero-point) energy $\hbar\omega\Xi_\kappa$ from the original Hamiltonian $\hbar\omega X_1^1$ to define X_0 . Hence, the vacuum energy in the broken second-quantized theory is:

$$E_0^\kappa = -\langle\theta|\hbar\omega\hat{\Xi}_\kappa|\theta\rangle = 2\kappa\hbar\omega s|\theta|^2, \quad (77)$$

since $\hat{\Xi}_\kappa$ is proportional to the total number of particles operator $\hat{N}$ in the second quantized theory, namely $\hat{\Xi}_\kappa = -2\kappa s\hat{N}$ [remember Eq. (13)]. Thus, this construction resembles somehow the actual cosmological models, where hyperbolic spatial geometries [$\kappa = -1$, like the Anti de Sitter space-time with spatial symmetry $O(2,1) \sim U(1,1)$], have negative vacuum energy (positive vacuum pressure), whereas for spherical spatial geometries [$\kappa = 1$, like de Sitter space with spatial symmetry $O(3) \simeq U(2)$], the vacuum pressure is negative and the expansion of empty space tends to speed up.

Going on with our ‘curvature-statistics connection’ hypothesis in cosmology, we could in principle discern between hyperbolic and spherical geometries for our universe by looking at the (BE and FD) nature of the vacuum thermal radiation seen by ‘non-inertial’ observers. Actually, BE and FD statistics have different qualitative behaviour at low frequencies. Before, it would be worth exploring whether this vacuum thermal radiation exists or not and whether it is observable/detectable by us or it is in fact already part of the observed cosmic microwave background radiation.

Other advantage of our derivation of the vacuum energy (77) is that it is free from the traditional drawbacks of ‘fine-tuning’, also referred to as the ‘unbearable lightness of space-time’ [1]. Indeed, we can make the parameter $|\theta|^2$ (the average number of zero modes in the ground state $|\theta\rangle$) as small as we like, thus eluding huge vacuum energies for either spherical or hyperbolic geometries.

Although we have restricted ourselves to curved phase spaces of constant curvature (complex projective spaces and open complex balls), we also paved the way for more general coset spaces like, for example, the ‘generalized open disk’ $\mathbb{D} = U(2,2)/U(2) \times U(2)$ (which can be conformally mapped one-to-one to the ‘tube domain’ in the ‘complex Minkowski phase space’), where a group-theoretical discussion of the Fulling-Unruh effect [2, 3] is in progress [20].

Acknowledgements

Work partially supported by the Fundación Séneca, Spanish MICINN and Junta de Andalucía under projects 08814/PI/08, FIS2008-06078-C03-01/FIS and FQM219, respectively.

References

- [1] G.E. Volovik: Vacuum energy: myths and reality, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **15** (2006) 1987-2010
- [2] Stephen A. Fulling: Nonuniqueness of Canonical Field Quantization in Riemannian Space-Time, *Phys. Rev. D* **7** (1973) 2850.
- [3] W. G. Unruh: Notes on black-hole evaporation, *Phys. Rev. D* **14** (1976) 870
- [4] S.W. Hawking: Black-hole explosions?, *Nature* **248** (1974) 30

- [5] V. Aldaya, M. Calixto and J.M. Cerveró: Vacuum radiation and symmetry breaking in conformally invariant quantum field theory, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **200** (1999) 325-354
- [6] M. Calixto and V. Aldaya: Curvature, zero modes and quantum statistics, *J. Phys.* **A39** (Math. & Gen.) (2006) L539-L545
- [7] M. Calixto and V. Aldaya: Broken unitary symmetries and Fermi-Dirac statistics, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A22** (2007) 3037-3045
- [8] A. Perelomov: *Generalized Coherent States and Their Applications*, Springer-Verlag (1986)
- [9] J.R. Klauder and Bo-Sture Skagerstam: *Coherent States: Applications in Physics and Mathematical Physics*, World Scientific (1985)
- [10] J.M. Souriau: *Structure des systemes dynamiques*, Dunod Paris (1970)
- [11] N. Woodhouse: *Geometric Quantization*, Oxford University Press (1980)
- [12] V. Aldaya and J.A. de Azcárraga: Quantization as a consequence of the symmetry group: an approach to geometric quantization, *J. Math. Phys.* **23** (1982) 1297
- [13] V. Aldaya, J. Guerrero and G. Marmo: Higher-order differential operators on a Lie group and quantization, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A12** (1997) 3
- [14] S. Helgason: *Differential Geometry, Lie Groups and Symmetric Spaces*, Academic Press, N.Y. 1978
- [15] M. Calixto: Higher $U(2,2)$ -spin fields and higher-dimensional W -gravities: quantum AdS space and radiation phenomena, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **18** (2001) 3857-3884
- [16] M. Calixto: Generalized W_∞ higher-spin algebras and symbolic calculus on flag manifolds, *J. Geom. Phys.* **56** (2006) 143-174
- [17] M. Calixto and J. Guerrero: Wavelet transform on the circle and the real line: a group-theoretical treatment, *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.* **21** (2006) 204-229
- [18] D.M. Gitman and A.L. Shelepin: Coherent states of $SU(N)$ groups, *J. Phys.* **A26** (Math. & Gen.) (1993) 313-327;
D.M. Gitman and A.L. Shelepin: Coherent states of $SU(l,1)$ groups, *J. Phys.* **A26** (Math. & Gen.) (1993) 7003-7018
- [19] E. L. Hill: On accelerated coordinate systems in classical and relativistic mechanics, *Phys. Rev.* **67**, 358 (1945).
- [20] M. Calixto, E. Perez-Romero and V. Aldaya: The Fulling-Unruh effect revisited: a group-theoretical perspective, in progress.